

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/512,500	KUROBA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gautam R. Patel	2655	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gautam R. Patel. (3) Mr. Charles Claunsh.
 (2) Mr. Pat Burns. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 01 December 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ohmi US patent 5,936,787.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mainly the remarks section of last office action on page 8 was explained. It was pointed out that since "or" clause was used. Ohmi does not have to satisfy all the limitations but only ONE of those limitations. And the Examiner was trying to make that point in his last action. As to the limitation of only phase being changed and not amplitude in the new arguments, it was pointed out that, that particular limitation has not been claimed. As to other points they are explained in detail in the new rejection that has been attached with this interview summary. It was also explained that the claims in their present form are not allowable over the prior art of record and as to possible new limitation that Applicants may add, further search and consideration will be needed.